

MESSENGER OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.

Mr. McCOMAS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger at an annual salary at the rate of \$1,440, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. HANSBROUGH submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the salary of the assistant clerk to the Committee on Public Lands, authorized by resolution of February 24, 1903, at \$1,200 per annum, be, and it hereby is, increased to \$1,800 per annum, to take effect January 1, 1904.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON PACIFIC RAILROADS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read. The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. MORGAN on the 1st instant, as follows:

Whereas it is asserted in public journals representing public opinion and exercising leading influence in the great political parties of the United States that the officers, managers, and agents of the transcontinental railroad companies, including the Canadian Pacific Railroad Company and other railroad companies, acting in concert or combination, or with a common purpose, or singly, have opposed, unlawfully, the public policy and laws of the United States in respect of the ratification by Colombia of the treaty known as the Hay-Herran treaty, and that such railroad companies in like manner are obstructing the full and complete execution of the duty and policy of the United States as declared in the act of Congress approved June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific oceans;" and

Whereas some of these railroad companies owe special duties of obedience to the laws and public policy of the United States in virtue of acts of Congress, and all of them that hold charters under the Federal laws and the State laws of the United States owe the duties of allegiance to the United States:

Resolved, That the Committee on Pacific Railroads is authorized and required, with due diligence, to make careful inquiry into the facts on which such charges are made, which show whether or not they support or sustain the same, and to report the testimony, with the findings of the committee, to the Senate.

And said committee shall have full power to send for persons or papers, and to summon witnesses to testify before them, and to administer oaths, by any member of said committee, and to take down the testimony.

And to this end said committee shall have authority to employ stenographers, to be paid for their services the allowance regulated by law, and also to pay witnesses for mileage and attendance in like manner.

The committee, if the committee so order, may hold their sessions at any place in the United States. The necessary expenses attending the performance of these duties shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon proper vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. Under the order of the Senate when the resolution was introduced it was laid upon the table subject to my call.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the other resolution, if the Senator pleases. The long resolution was the one laid on the table subject to the call of the Senator. This resolution, under the rule, the Chair will be obliged to send to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, does the resolution go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate before it goes to any other committee?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does. It goes there at once.

ISTHMIAN CANAL INQUIRY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama offered another resolution on the 1st instant, which was laid on the table subject to his call.

Mr. MORGAN. Of that I was aware.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is there now, subject to his call.

Mr. MORGAN. There is no occasion for taking any order in reference to that resolution this morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; not before the Senator desires to call it up.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not call it up to-day.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH CUBA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

Mr. CULLOM. If there is no further morning business, I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no need of doing that. On Monday, by unanimous consent, the consideration of the bill will be proceeded with.

Mr. CULLOM. I did not know but that some Senator would like to speak on it to-day. That is the only reason I have for calling it up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 1921) to carry into effect a con-

vention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902.

Mr. CULLOM. If there is any Senator desiring to speak on the bill to-day, it is in order now to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will be glad to recognize any Senator for that purpose.

Mr. CULLOM. If no Senator desires to speak, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 7, 1903, at 11 o'clock and 30 minutes a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, December 5, 1903.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of the following committees:

Elections No. 1.—Messrs. James R. Mann, Illinois; Llewellyn Powers, Maine; Charles L. Knapp, New York; Joseph H. Gaines, West Virginia; Arthur L. Bates, Pennsylvania; Olin H. Young, Michigan; Ollie M. James, Kentucky; E. J. Bowers, Mississippi; Scott Field, Texas.

Elections No. 2.—Messrs. Marlin E. Olmsted, Pennsylvania; James M. Miller, Kansas; Frank D. Currier, New Hampshire; John W. Dwight, New York; Capell L. Weems, Ohio; Frederick Landis, Indiana; Joshua F. C. Talbot, Maryland; A. M. Byrd, Mississippi; John A. Sullivan, Massachusetts.

Elections No. 3.—Messrs. Michael E. Driscoll, New York; Kittredge Haskins, Vermont; H. Burd Cassel, Pennsylvania; James Kennedy, Ohio; John A. Sterling, Illinois; Benjamin P. Birdsall, Iowa; Frank A. McLain, Mississippi; Choice B. Randell, Texas; Joseph T. Johnson, South Carolina.

Appropriations.—Messrs. James A. Hemenway, Indiana; Henry H. Bingham, Pennsylvania; Henry C. Van Voorhis, Ohio; James T. McCleary, Minnesota; Lucius N. Littauer, New York; Walter P. Brownlow, Tennessee; Washington Gardner, Michigan; Elmer J. Burkett, Nebraska; Frederick H. Gillett, Massachusetts; Walter I. Smith, Iowa; Benjamin F. Marsh, Illinois; Leonidas F. Livingston, Georgia; Rice A. Pierce, Tennessee; Mæcenas E. Benton, Missouri; George W. Taylor, Alabama; Oscar W. Underwood, Alabama; Stephen Brundidge, jr., Arkansas.

Judiciary.—Messrs. John J. Jenkins, Wisconsin; Richard Wayne Parker, New Jersey; De Alva S. Alexander, New York; Vespasian Warner, Illinois; Charles E. Littlefield, Maine; Lot Thomas, Iowa; Samuel Leland Powers, Massachusetts; Robert M. Nevin, Ohio; Henry W. Palmer, Pennsylvania; George A. Pearre, Maryland; J. N. Gillett, California; David A. De Armond, Missouri; David H. Smith, Kentucky; Henry D. Clayton, Alabama; Robert L. Henry, Texas; John S. Little, Arkansas; William G. Brantley, Georgia.

Banking and Currency.—Messrs. Charles N. Fowler, New Jersey; George W. Prince, Illinois; William A. Calderhead, Kansas; William C. Lovering, Massachusetts; William H. Douglas, New York; Llewellyn Powers, Maine; B. F. Spalding, North Dakota; Henry McMorran, Michigan; Capell L. Weems, Ohio; George D. McCreary, Pennsylvania; M. J. Daniels, California; John R. Thayer, Massachusetts; Elijah B. Lewis, Georgia; Lemuel P. Padgett, Tennessee; Charles L. Bartlett, Georgia; Charles W. Thompson, Alabama; Arsene P. Pujol, Louisiana.

Coinage, Weights, and Measures.—Messrs. James H. Southard, Ohio; Justin D. Bowersock, Kansas; Thomas Hedge, Iowa; Arthur L. Bates, Pennsylvania; George W. Cromer, Indiana; John W. Dwight, New York; William M. Lanning, New Jersey; James W. Brown, Pennsylvania; Solomon R. Dresser, Pennsylvania; George J. Smith, New York; Charles F. Cochran, Missouri; John F. Shafroth, Colorado; James M. Griggs, Georgia; John W. Gaines, Tennessee; Ezekiel S. Candler, Mississippi; John S. Rhea, Kentucky; Timothy D. Sullivan, New York; J. S. Wilson, Arizona.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce.—Messrs. William P. Hepburn, Iowa; James S. Sherman, New York; Irving P. Wanger, Pennsylvania; James R. Mann, Illinois; William C. Lovering, Massachusetts; Fred C. Stevens, Minnesota; Charles H. Burke, South Dakota; John J. Esch, Wisconsin; Francis W. Cushman, Washington; Thomas B. Kyle, Ohio; Charles E. Townsend, Michigan; Robert C. Davey, Louisiana; William C. Adamson, Georgia; Dorsey W. Shackelford, Missouri; William H. Ryan, New York; William Richardson, Alabama; William B. Lamar, Florida.

Rivers and Harbors.—Messrs. Theodore E. Burton, Ohio; Blackburn B. Dovener, West Virginia; Roswell P. Bishop, Michigan; Ernest F. Acheson, Pennsylvania; De Alva S. Alexander, New York; George P. Lawrence, Massachusetts; James H. Davidson,

Wisconsin; James McLachlan, California; William Lorimer, Illinois; Wesley L. Jones, Washington; J. Adam Bede, Minnesota; Rufus E. Lester, Georgia; John H. Bankhead, Alabama; Stephen M. Sparkman, Florida; Joseph E. Ransdell, Louisiana; George F. Burgess, Texas; B. G. Humphreys, Mississippi.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries.—Messrs. Charles H. Grosvenor, Ohio; Edward S. Minor, Wisconsin; William S. Greene, Massachusetts; Fred C. Stevens, Minnesota; Joseph W. Fordney, Michigan; Frank C. Wachter, Maryland; Charles E. Littlefield, Maine; William E. Humphrey, Washington; William H. Flack, New York; Benjamin P. Birdsall, Iowa; William W. Wilson, Illinois; Thomas Spight, Mississippi; John H. Small, North Carolina; Robert W. Davis, Florida; Allan L. McDermott, New Jersey; Alfred Lucking, Michigan; Joseph A. Goulden, New York.

Agriculture.—Messrs. James W. Wadsworth, New York; E. Stevens Henry, Connecticut; Charles F. Wright, Pennsylvania; Gilbert N. Haugen, Iowa; Charles F. Scott, Kansas; Kittredge Haskins, Vermont; Joseph V. Graff, Illinois; George W. Cromer, Indiana; William Lorimer, Illinois; Franklin E. Brooks, Colorado; H. C. Adams, Wisconsin; John Lamb, Virginia; Sydney J. Bowie, Alabama; Albert S. Burleson, Texas; Asbury F. Lever, South Carolina; Phanor Breazeale, Louisiana; John W. Cassingham, Ohio; Bernard S. Rodey, New Mexico.

Foreign Affairs.—Messrs. Robert R. Hitt, Illinois; Robert Adams, jr., Pennsylvania; Robert G. Cousins, Iowa; Wm. Alden Smith, Michigan; Charles B. Landis, Indiana; James Breck Perkins, New York; Jacob A. Beidler, Ohio; David J. Foster, Vermont; Theobald Otjen, Wisconsin; Adin B. Capron, Rhode Island; Nicholas Longworth, Ohio; Hugh A. Dinsmore, Arkansas; William M. Howard, Georgia; Albert S. Burleson, Texas; Townsend Scudder, New York; James N. Kehoe, Kentucky; Henry D. Flood, Virginia.

Military Affairs.—Messrs. John A. T. Hull, Iowa; John H. Ketcham, New York; Richard Wayne Parker, New Jersey; Adin B. Capron, Rhode Island; Fred C. Stevens, Minnesota; Charles Dick, Ohio; Frank W. Mondell, Wyoming; John J. Esch, Wisconsin; George W. Prince, Illinois; Elias S. Holliday, Indiana; H. Olin Young, Michigan; William Sulzer, New York; James Hay, Virginia; James L. Slayden, Texas; Robert F. Broussard, Louisiana; William F. Mahoney, Illinois; James W. Denny, Maryland; Bird S. McGuire, Oklahoma.

Naval Affairs.—Messrs. George E. Foss, Illinois; Alston G. Dayton, West Virginia; Henry C. Loudenslager, New Jersey; Thomas S. Butler, Pennsylvania; Sydney E. Mudd, Maryland; Robert G. Cousins, Iowa; Ernest W. Roberts, Massachusetts; Edward B. Vreeland, New York; Abraham L. Brick, Indiana; Frank B. Bran-degee, Connecticut; George Alvin Loud, Michigan; Adolph Meyer, Louisiana; Farish Carter Tate, Georgia; John F. Rixey, Virginia; William W. Kitchin, North Carolina; Willard D. Vandiver, Missouri; Martin J. Wade, Iowa.

Post-Office and Post-Roads.—Messrs. Jesse Overstreet, Indiana; John J. Gardner, New Jersey; Nehemiah D. Sperry, Connecticut; Thomas Hedge, Iowa; Joseph C. Sibley, Pennsylvania; Howard M. Snapp, Illinois; Herman P. Goebel, Ohio; Halvor Steenerson, Minnesota; William H. Stafford, Wisconsin; Archibald B. Darragh, Michigan; Victor Murdock, Kansas; John A. Moon, Tennessee; James M. Griggs, Georgia; William S. Cowherd, Missouri; Frank E. Wilson, New York; David E. Finley, South Carolina; Theodore F. Klutzz, North Carolina; Jonah Kalanianale, Hawaii.

Public Lands.—Messrs. John F. Lacey, Iowa; Frank W. Mondell, Wyoming; James M. Miller, Kansas; James C. Needham, California; Eben W. Martin, South Dakota; Joseph W. Fordney, Michigan; Andrew J. Volstead, Minnesota; Joseph M. Dixon, Montana; Philip Knopf, Illinois; George Shiras III, Pennsylvania; J. J. McCarthy, Nebraska; John F. Shafroth, Colorado; Francis M. Griffith, Indiana; John L. Burnett, Alabama; George P. Foster, Illinois; William W. Rucker, Missouri; Carter Glass, Virginia; Bernard S. Rodey, New Mexico.

Indian Affairs.—Messrs. James S. Sherman, New York; Charles Curtis, Kansas; John F. Lacey, Iowa; Thomas F. Marshall, North Dakota; Webster E. Brown, Wisconsin; Charles H. Burke, South Dakota; Charles L. Knapp, New York; Binger Hermann, Oregon; C. B. Buckman, Minnesota; Edmund H. Hinshaw, Nebraska; Herschel M. Hogg, Colorado; John H. Stephens, Texas; William T. Zenor, Indiana; John J. Fitzgerald, New York; John Dougherty, Missouri; James McAndrews, Illinois; Charles C. Reid, Arkansas; Bernard S. Rodey, New Mexico.

Territories.—Messrs. Edward L. Hamilton, Michigan; Abraham L. Brick, Indiana; Adin B. Capron, Rhode Island; George N. Southwick, New York; Llewellyn Powers, Maine; William H. Jackson, Maryland; B. F. Spalding, North Dakota; George L. Lilley, Connecticut; John A. Sterling, Illinois; John A. Moon, Tennessee; James T. Lloyd, Missouri; James M. Robinson, Indiana; John R. Thayer, Massachusetts; Gordon Russell, Texas; Charles C. Reid, Arkansas; Bird S. McGuire, Oklahoma; J. S. Wilson, Arizona.

Insular Affairs.—Messrs. Henry A. Cooper, Wisconsin; James A. Tawney, Minnesota; Edgar D. Crumpacker, Indiana; Edward L. Hamilton, Michigan; Marlin E. Olmsted, Pennsylvania; George W. Smith, Illinois; William R. Warnock, Ohio; James Carson Needham, California; Charles E. Fuller, Illinois; William M. Lanning, New Jersey; M. P. Kinkaid, Nebraska; William A. Jones, Virginia; John W. Maddox, Georgia; James R. Williams, Illinois; Malcolm R. Patterson, Tennessee; James M. Robinson, Indiana; Wilson S. Hill, Mississippi.

Railways and Canals.—Messrs. James H. Davidson, Wisconsin; Ernest W. Roberts, Massachusetts; William W. Skiles, Ohio; Elias Deemer, Pennsylvania; Charles L. Knapp, New York; George F. Huff, Pennsylvania; Harry C. Woodyard, West Virginia; Allen F. Cooper, Pennsylvania; John L. Burnett, Alabama; William F. Mahoney, Illinois; De Witt C. Badger, Ohio; Joseph H. Shull, Pennsylvania; John N. Garner, Texas.

Manufactures.—Messrs. Joseph C. Sibley, Pennsylvania; William S. Greene, Massachusetts; Henry McMorran, Michigan; Norton P. Otis, New York; Amos H. Jackson, Ohio; Willard D. Vandiver, Missouri; Martin Emerich, Illinois; C. H. Weisse, Wisconsin; John T. Hunt, Missouri; George W. Croft, South Carolina.

Mines and Mining.—Messrs. Webster E. Brown, Wisconsin; George R. Patterson, Pennsylvania; Charles F. Scott, Kansas; George F. Huff, Pennsylvania; Joseph M. Dixon, Montana; J. N. Williamson, Oregon; Joseph Howell, Utah; Farish Carter Tate, Georgia; John Dougherty, Missouri; George Howell, Pennsylvania; A. O. Stanley, Kentucky; Frank E. Shober, New York; J. S. Wilson, Arizona.

Public Buildings and Grounds.—Messrs. Charles W. Gillet, New York; Richard Bartholdt, Missouri; Edwin C. Burleigh, Maine; Benjamin F. Howell, New Jersey; James P. Conner, Iowa; Eben W. Martin, South Dakota; Edward S. Minor, Wisconsin; William A. Rodenberg, Illinois; George W. Norris, Nebraska; John H. Bankhead, Alabama; William G. Brantley, Georgia; Charles R. Thomas, North Carolina; Robert W. Miers, Indiana; Morris Sheppard, Texas; Robert B. Scarborough, South Carolina.

Pacific Railroads.—Messrs. Wm. Alden Smith, Michigan; Michael E. Driscoll, New York; William H. Jackson, Maryland; Stephen R. Morgan, Ohio; Theobald Otjen, Wisconsin; Henry W. Palmer, Pennsylvania; M. P. Kinkaid, Nebraska; Sydney E. Mudd, Maryland; M. J. Daniels, California; William J. Wynn, California; James L. Slayden, Texas; David E. Finley, South Carolina; Robert Baker, New York; Henry T. Rainey, Illinois; John Lind, Minnesota.

Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.—Messrs. Richard Bartholdt, Missouri; George W. Prince, Illinois; Thomas Hedge, Iowa; William A. Rodenberg, Illinois; George F. Huff, Pennsylvania; C. B. Buckman, Minnesota; Allen F. Cooper, Pennsylvania; Robert F. Broussard, Louisiana; Harry L. Maynard, Virginia; R. M. Wallace, Arkansas; James J. Butler, Missouri; R. Bruce Macon, Arkansas.

Education.—Messrs. George N. Southwick, New York; Charles Q. Tirrell, Massachusetts; Thomas B. Kyle, Ohio; Elmer J. Burkett, Nebraska; Burton L. French, Idaho; Reuben O. Moon, Pennsylvania; William E. Humphrey, Washington; Willard D. Vandiver, Missouri; E. Y. Webb, North Carolina; Ira Edgar Rider, New York; M. C. Fitzpatrick, Tennessee; O. W. Gillespie, Texas.

Labor.—Messrs. John J. Gardner, New Jersey; Richard Bartholdt, Missouri; Samuel W. McCall, Massachusetts; Edward B. Vreeland, New York; David J. Foster, Vermont; James P. Conner, Iowa; B. F. Spalding, North Dakota; Herman P. Goebel, Ohio; Ben F. Caldwell, Illinois; George G. Gilbert, Kentucky; John W. Maddox, Georgia; William Randolph Hearst, New York; William Hughes, New Jersey.

Militia.—Messrs. Charles Dick, Ohio; John A. T. Hull, Iowa; Joseph H. Gaines, West Virginia; George W. Smith, Illinois; Halvor Steenerson, Minnesota; Butler Ames, Massachusetts; William O. Smith, Pennsylvania; Joseph B. Crowley, Illinois; Jacob Ruppert, jr., New York; Ariosto A. Wiley, Alabama; Edward M. Bassett, New York; John A. Keliher, Massachusetts.

Patents.—Messrs. William W. Skiles, Ohio; Frank D. Currier, New Hampshire; Norton P. Otis, New York; Solomon R. Dresser, Pennsylvania; Amos H. Jackson, Ohio; Joseph M. Dixon, Montana; Edmund H. Hinshaw, Nebraska; William Sulzer, New York; George S. Legare, South Carolina; E. Y. Webb, North Carolina; Charles H. Dickerman, Pennsylvania; Francis Burton Harrison, New York.

Invalid Pensions.—Messrs. Cyrus A. Sulloway, New Hampshire; Henry R. Gibson, Tennessee; Samuel W. Smith, Michigan; William A. Calderhead, Kansas; Elias Deemer, Pennsylvania; Elias S. Holliday, Indiana; W. Godfrey Hunter, Kentucky; Thomas W. Bradley, New York; Charles E. Fuller, Illinois; Robert W. Miers, Indiana; Joseph B. Crowley, Illinois; George H. Lindsay, New York; John S. Snook, Ohio; Alfred Lucking, Michigan; F. A. Hopkins, Kentucky.

Pensions.—Messrs. Henry C. Loudenslager, New Jersey; George R. Patterson, Pennsylvania; William H. Draper, New York; P. P. Campbell, Kansas; Butler Ames, Massachusetts; James W. Brown, Pennsylvania; Herschel M. Hogg, Colorado; Nicholas Longworth, Ohio; William Richardson, Alabama; Ariosto A. Wiley, Alabama; Frank A. McLain, Mississippi; Henry A. Houston, Delaware; George W. Croft, South Carolina.

Claims.—Messrs. Joseph V. Graff, Illinois; Lot Thomas, Iowa; Thomas S. Butler, Pennsylvania; Robert M. Nevin, Ohio; David J. Foster, Vermont; James M. Miller, Kansas; Charles Q. Tirrell, Massachusetts; Joseph Howell, Utah; Henry M. Goldfogle, New York; Claude Kitchin, North Carolina; South Trimble, Kentucky; D. Linn Gooch, Kentucky; John Lind, Minnesota; William S. McNary, Massachusetts; Jack Beall, Texas.

War Claims.—Messrs. Thaddeus M. Mahon, Pennsylvania; Henry R. Gibson, Tennessee; Theobald Otjen, Wisconsin; Gilbert N. Haugen, Iowa; Kittredge Haskins, Vermont; Elias S. Holliday, Indiana; Burton L. French, Idaho; James H. Southard, Ohio; Thetus W. Sims, Tennessee; Ben F. Caldwell, Illinois; Thomas Spight, Mississippi; Joseph T. Johnson, South Carolina; A. W. Gregg, Texas.

Private Land Claims.—Messrs. George W. Smith, Illinois; Alvin Evans, Pennsylvania; Charles Q. Hildebrandt, Ohio; Thomas F. Marshall, North Dakota; Francis W. Cushman, Washington; George J. Smith, New York; ————; William A. Jones, Virginia; George G. Gilbert, Kentucky; W. R. Smith, Texas; R. M. Wallace, Arkansas; Wyatt Aiken, South Carolina; C. H. Weisse, Wisconsin; Bird S. McGuire, Oklahoma.

District of Columbia.—Messrs. Joseph W. Babcock, Wisconsin; Samuel W. Smith, Michigan; Amos L. Allen, Maine; James W. Wadsworth, New York; Edward De V. Morrell, Pennsylvania; Samuel L. Powers, Massachusetts; Stephen R. Morgan, Ohio; Campbell Slemple, Virginia; C. R. Davis, Minnesota; P. P. Campbell, Kansas; William H. Wiley, New Jersey; Adolph Meyer, Louisiana; William S. Cowherd, Missouri; Thetus W. Sims, Tennessee; James McAndrews, Illinois; Edward W. Pou, North Carolina; D. Linn Gooch, Kentucky.

Revision of the Laws.—Messrs. Vespasian Warner, Illinois; Henry R. Gibson, Tennessee; Alston G. Dayton, West Virginia; Alvin Evans, Pennsylvania; Charles Q. Tirrell, Massachusetts; Charles E. Littlefield, Maine; Reuben O. Moon, Pennsylvania; Charles T. Dunwell, New York; D. L. D. Granger, Rhode Island; R. Bruce Macon, Arkansas; Thomas W. Hardwick, Georgia; Robert Lamar, Missouri; Swagar Sherley, Kentucky.

Reform in the Civil Service.—Messrs. Frederick H. Gillett, Massachusetts; John F. Lacey, Iowa; Charles N. Fowler, New Jersey; Justin D. Bowersock, Kansas; James R. Mann, Illinois; William O. Smith, Pennsylvania; Amos L. Allen, Maine; Jacob A. Beidler, Ohio; Edward W. Pou, North Carolina; William T. Zenor, Indiana; Edward M. Bassett, New York; R. G. Southall, Virginia; Robert N. Page, North Carolina.

Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.—Messrs. Joseph H. Gaines, West Virginia; Cyrus A. Sulloway, New Hampshire; Henry S. Boutell, Illinois; Binger Hermann, Oregon; Daniel F. Lafean, Pennsylvania; George W. Norris, Nebraska; Franklin E. Brooks, Colorado; Charles T. Dunwell, New York; William W. Rucker, Missouri; Phanor Breazeale, Louisiana; John S. Rhea, Kentucky; O. W. Gillespie, Texas; Thomas W. Hardwick, Georgia.

Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.—Messrs. Nehemiah D. Sperry, Connecticut; Justin D. Bowersock, Kansas; Amos L. Allen, Maine; Stephen R. Morgan, Ohio; William H. Draper, New York; Henry Kirke Porter, Pennsylvania; John L. Burnett, Alabama; George H. Lindsay, New York; J. M. Gudger, jr., North Carolina; Harvey C. Garber, Ohio; John M. Pinkney, Texas.

Irrigation of Arid Lands.—Messrs. Frank W. Mondell, Wyoming; William A. Reeder, Kansas; Charles Q. Tirrell, Massachusetts; John W. Dwight, New York; Thomas F. Marshall, North Dakota; Allen F. Cooper, Pennsylvania; J. N. Williamson, Oregon; Oscar W. Underwood, Alabama; Gilbert M. Hitchcock, Nebraska; C. D. Van Duzer, Nevada; Theodore A. Bell, California.

Immigration and Naturalization.—Messrs. Benjamin F. Howell, New Jersey; Robert Adams, jr., Pennsylvania; William W. Skiles, Ohio; William H. Douglas, New York; Alvin Evans, Pennsylvania; Augustus P. Gardner, Massachusetts; Burton L. French, Idaho; Jacob Ruppert, jr., New York; Edward Robb, Missouri; Allan Benny, New Jersey; E. J. Livernash, California.

Ventilation and Acoustics.—Messrs. Roswell P. Bishop, Michigan; Jacob A. Beidler, Ohio; Thomas W. Bradley, New York; ————; David H. Smith, Kentucky; George H. Lindsay, New York; Marcus C. L. Kline, Pennsylvania.

Expenditures in the State Department.—Messrs. John H. Ketcham, New York; David J. Foster, Vermont; Robert Adams, jr., Pennsylvania; W. Godfrey Hunter, Kentucky; Rufus E. Lester, Georgia; Claude Kitchin, North Carolina; John N. Garner, Texas.

Expenditures in the Treasury Department.—Messrs. Robert G.

Cousins, Iowa; Edward De V. Morrell, Pennsylvania; Philip Knopf, Illinois; Ebenezer J. Hill, Connecticut; John Lamb, Virginia; Harvey C. Garber, Ohio; J. M. Gudger, jr., North Carolina.

Expenditures in the War Department.—Messrs. William R. Warnock, Ohio; George P. Lawrence, Massachusetts; J. Adam Bede, Minnesota; Campbell Slemple, Virginia; George F. Burgess, Texas; De Witt C. Badger, Ohio; M. C. Fitzpatrick, Tennessee.

Expenditures in the Navy Department.—Messrs. William S. Greene, Massachusetts; Joseph W. Fordney, Michigan; Ernest F. Acheson, Pennsylvania; Daniel F. Lafean, Pennsylvania; Charles W. Thompson, Alabama; Choice B. Randell, Texas; Ollie M. James, Kentucky.

Expenditures in the Post-Office Department.—Messrs. Irving P. Wanger, Pennsylvania; William H. Flack, New York; George L. Lilley, Connecticut; George W. Cromer, Indiana; Edward Robb, Missouri; George G. Gilbert, Kentucky; Carter Glass, Virginia.

Expenditures in the Interior Department.—Messrs. Edward S. Minor, Wisconsin; Blackburn B. Dovener, West Virginia; George R. Patterson, Pennsylvania; H. C. Adams, Wisconsin; Ezekiel S. Candler, jr., Mississippi; George P. Foster, Illinois; Robert N. Page, North Carolina.

Expenditures in the Department of Justice.—Messrs. William A. Calderhead, Kansas; Eben W. Martin, South Dakota; Henry Kirke Porter, Pennsylvania; J. J. McCarthy, Nebraska; Henry M. Goldfogle, New York; Charles F. Cochran, Missouri; John H. Stephens, Texas.

Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.—Messrs. Charles F. Wright, Pennsylvania; Frank B. Brandegee, Connecticut; William E. Humphrey, Washington; C. R. Davis, Minnesota; Henry D. Flood, Virginia; James N. Kehoe, Kentucky; Sidney J. Bowie, Alabama.

Expenditures on Public Buildings.—Messrs. James A. Hughes, West Virginia; J. N. Gillett, California; Augustus P. Gardner, Massachusetts; E. Stevens Henry, Connecticut; John H. Small, North Carolina; Harry L. Maynard, Virginia; South Trimble, Kentucky.

Accounts.—Messrs. Charles Q. Hildebrandt, Ohio; James A. Hughes, West Virginia; Joseph V. Graff, Illinois; Frank D. Currier, New Hampshire; H. Burd Cassel, Pennsylvania; William H. Draper, New York; Charles L. Bartlett, Georgia; Hugh A. Dinsmore, Arkansas; Martin Emerich, Illinois.

Census.—Messrs. Edgar D. Crumpacker, Indiana; Edwin C. Burleigh, Maine; James A. Hughes, West Virginia; George A. Pearre, Maryland; H. Burd Cassel, Pennsylvania; Charles T. Dunwell, New York; James Kennedy, Ohio; Butler Ames, Massachusetts; Francis M. Griffith, Indiana; James Hay, Virginia; Albert S. Burleson, Texas; G. B. Patterson, North Carolina; Joe T. Robinson, Arkansas.

Library.—Messrs. James T. McCleary, Minnesota; Samuel W. McCall, Massachusetts; James P. Conner, Iowa; James D. Richardson, Tennessee; William M. Howard, Georgia.

Printing.—Messrs. Charles B. Landis, Indiana; James B. Perkins, New York; Farish C. Tate, Georgia.

Industrial Arts and Expositions.—Messrs. James A. Tawney, Minnesota; James S. Sherman, New York; Augustus P. Gardner, Massachusetts; John J. Gardner, New Jersey; Justin D. Bowersock, Kansas; William A. Rodenberg, Illinois; Joseph Howell, Utah; Henry Kirke Porter, Pennsylvania; Harry C. Woodyard, West Virginia; Charles L. Bartlett, Georgia; Harry L. Maynard, Virginia; Courtney W. Hamlin, Missouri; William J. Wynn, California; George S. Legare, South Carolina; Francis Burton Harrison, New York.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed resolutions of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Joint resolution (S. R. 18) providing for printing the general index to published volumes of the diplomatic correspondence and foreign relations of the United States.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 13.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed and bound 3,000 copies of Senate Document No. 452, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, entitled "Treaties, Laws, Executive Orders, etc., relating to Indian Affairs," as revised, 300 of which shall be for the use of the Senate, 800 for the House of Representatives, 200 for the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 50 for the House Committee on Indian Affairs, 50 for the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, and the remaining 1,100 shall be sold by the superintendent of documents.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 21.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed and bound of the proceedings of Congress upon the acceptance of the statutes of Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, and John Hanson, presented by the State of Maryland, 16,500 copies, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and the remaining 1,500 copies shall be for the use and distribution of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Maryland.

The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer, who shall procure suitable copper-process plates to be bound with these memorials.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 4.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed, and bound in the form such as is customary in the case of eulogies, with accompanying illustrations, 10,000 copies of the proceedings upon the unveiling of the statue of the Count de Rochambeau, of which 3,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 6,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, 500 to be delivered to the ambassador of the Republic of France for such distribution as he shall think fit, the remaining 500, of which 200 shall be bound in full morocco, to be distributed, under the direction of the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, to the guests invited from the French Republic and the speakers who took part in said celebration.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate resolutions were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

Senate concurrent resolution No. 13:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed and bound 3,000 copies of Senate Document No. 452, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, entitled "Treaties, Laws, Executive Orders, etc., relating to Indian Affairs," as revised, 300 of which shall be for the use of the Senate, 800 for the House of Representatives, 200 for the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 50 for the House Committee on Indian Affairs, 50 for the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, and the remaining 1,100 shall be sold by the superintendent of documents—

to the Committee on Printing.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 21:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed and bound of the proceedings of Congress upon the acceptance of the statues of Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, and John Hanson, presented by the State of Maryland, 16,500 copies, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and the remaining 1,500 copies shall be for the use and distribution of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Maryland.

The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer, who shall procure suitable copper-process plates to be bound with these memorials—

to the Committee on Printing.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 4:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed, and bound in the form such as is customary in the case of eulogies, with accompanying illustrations, 10,000 copies of the proceedings upon the unveiling of the statue of the Count de Rochambeau, of which 3,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 6,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, 500 to be delivered to the ambassador of the Republic of France for such distribution as he shall think fit, the remaining 500, of which 200 shall be bound in full morocco, to be distributed, under the direction of the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, to the guests invited from the French Republic and the speakers who took part in said celebration—

to the Committee on Printing.

Joint resolution (S. R. 18) providing for printing the general index to published volumes of the diplomatic correspondence and foreign relations of the United States—to the Committee on Printing.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries.

PORTO RICO.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the third annual report of the governor of Porto Rico, covering the period from July 1, 1902, to June 30, 1903, with appendices.

WHITE HOUSE, December 4, 1903.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That authority is granted to print and bind, for use of the Committee on Appropriations, all documents deemed necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by said committee during the Fifty-eighth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I should like to ask the gentleman from Indiana a question. Is that just the usual resolution?

Mr. HEMENWAY. The usual resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. There will be no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Also the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, or such subcommittee as they may designate, shall have leave to sit during the sessions of the House during the Fifty-eighth Congress, and during the recess.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

GENERAL DEBATE.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask unanimous consent that there may be thirty minutes allowed to this side of the House this morning and thirty allowed to that side of the House for purposes of general discussion on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] asks unanimous consent that thirty minutes may be given to the minority for general debate, the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to that if it includes the majority also.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I said thirty minutes also for the majority.

The SPEAKER. The request is for unanimous consent that one hour be allowed for debate, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Mississippi and one-half by the gentleman from New York. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I wish to yield fifteen minutes of the time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, in the discussion that occurred in the House a few days ago a statement, or an assumption rather, made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] struck my attention. The gentleman built the whole of his argument upon this proposition, that the statistics of national wealth showed that we possessed in 1860, \$16,000,000,000, and that since that date the wealth of the country had increased to eighty-six billions, or an increase of seventy billions, which the gentleman assumed was due entirely to the prevalence of Republican policies since 1860.

It is said, Mr. Speaker, that a short time ago two law students in the city of Chicago were discussing the proposition as to who was the greatest lawyer in Illinois, and as the discussion waxed warm a member of the Chicago bar, whose name had not been mentioned in that connection by either of them, was seen approaching. They agreed to leave the decision of the question to him, and so when he came up they said: "Colonel, we have had a warm discussion here as to who is the greatest lawyer in Illinois, and being unable to settle it we have agreed to take your decision upon the matter. Who, Colonel, is the greatest lawyer in the State of Illinois?" The colonel drew himself up, tapped his ample chest, and said: "I am." "Well," they said, "Colonel, how will you prove it?" "Prove it; you do not have to prove it. I will admit it." [Laughter.]

So with the argument of the gentleman from Iowa. He submits a proposition as to conditions, and admits the Republican policy is responsible for all of them. But the gentleman absolutely fails to allow anything in the equation for the increase of population since 1860. He sets off the productive energies of 17,000,000 people in 1840 against 50,000,000 people in 1880. He regards the capacity to produce and save wealth of 23,000,000 people in 1850 to be as great as the productive activity and capacity of 62,000,000 people in 1890. He contends that the foot-tons of industrial energy exercised by 31,000,000 people in 1860 shall equal that exercised by 75,000,000 people in 1900. He allows nothing at all in the equation for the fact that the farmer now, with improved machinery, can cultivate 100 acres of land and produce infinitely more wealth than the farmer of thirty-five or forty years ago who could only cultivate 25 acres of land.

But there is another proposition in this connection to which I wish to invite the attention of the gentleman from Iowa. From the report made the other day by the Secretary of Agriculture it appears that the balance of trade against this country, eliminating the products made by the farmers of the United States, was \$62,000,000, and the average annual production of the farmers for the last thirteen years was \$337,000,000. The trade balance in our favor was the result of the productive energy of the farmers

of the United States, who offset the balance of trade against us and put to the credit of this country, says the Secretary of Agriculture, \$275,000,000 annually for thirteen years. This balance of trade, then—which the gentleman spoke the other day—has been made by that element in the country that has borne the burdens of Republican policy and received none or very few of its benefits.

But I want to accommodate myself, Mr. Speaker, to the strange reasoning of the gentleman, and assume the proposition, temporarily at least, that the policies of the dominant party are responsible for the progress and wealth of the country while they are in power. Suppose we take the year 1860. The statistical report for 1860 shows that the population of the country between that date and 1850 had increased 35.46 per cent; that the manufactured products of the country during that same period had increased 86 per cent; that the improved lands of the country increased 44 per cent; that the banking capital of the country increased 53 per cent; and that the general wealth of the country in that decade increased 126 per cent.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] flashed his sword in the tariff discussion when the Cuban reciprocity bill was up the other day, and asked what law passed by the Democracy, what act passed by the Democracy, had ever added to the glory of the flag and prosperity of the people.

Why, sir, does not the gentleman from Indiana know that between 1850 and 1860 the wealth of the State of Pennsylvania increased more than 56 per cent, that the wealth of the State of Indiana increased 169 per cent, and that the wealth of the State of Iowa increased over 942 per cent? Why, sir, but for the statesmanship of a Democratic President, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana, there would not have been added to the public domain of this country 1,124,685 square miles of territory. But for the same statesmanship of the Democracy the gentleman from Iowa might be a citizen of the French Republic and known among his compatriots as GUILLAUME PIERRE HEPBURN, instead of the champion of Republican doctrines on the floor of this House. [Laughter.]

Before leaving the subject, I desire to embrace in my remarks a statement made by Joseph C. G. Kennedy, Superintendent of the Census of 1860, and transmitted to the Congress in 1862 by Caleb B. Smith, Secretary of the Interior. I read a short paragraph from the conclusion of that report:

The figures which we have given make it appear that during the decade from 1850 to 1860 our population, in the aggregate, has increased more than 35 per cent. More than 5,000,000 acres of land were brought into cultivation. The productions of agriculture multiplied in ratio greater than the population. The products of manufacture increased \$900,000,000, or at the rate of 86 per cent. The banking capital ran up from \$227,469,074 in 1850 to \$421,880,095 in 1860, while the circulating currency was augmented \$52,089,560. The amount of insurances increased about \$311,000,000. More than 22,000 miles of railroad were completed, and the capital involved increased from \$295,640,148 in 1850 to \$1,151,550,829 in 1860; while to indicate on the map of our country the lines of telegraph would be to represent the web of the spider over its entire surface. Our internal and foreign trade kept pace with our advance in production and increase of capital. Education, free to a great extent, has been made more accessible, and crime has rather diminished. We experienced no effects of widespread pestilence, and our country seemed the chosen abode of prosperity and peace.

So said the Director of the Census of 1860, and according to the reasoning of the gentleman from Iowa the prevalence of Democratic policies was the cause of that prosperity in that decade just mentioned. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But, to go a little further, and to follow out the gentleman's argument to its legitimate conclusion, which is that the prevalence of Republican policies since 1860 is the cause of the present condition of the country as we find it to-day. Now, Mr. Speaker, in 1860 the public expenditures of this country were \$77,035,125.65. In 1902, under the Republican policy, the public expenditures had reached the figure of \$593,038,904.90. In 1902 extravagance had so grown up, under Republican domination, until the money expended in that year was five hundred and ninety millions in round numbers.

In 1860 the national debt was \$64,842,287.80. In 1902 it had increased to \$2,111,654,973.89, an increase of \$2,046,812,686.09. The total of public and private debts, according to the statement made by Mr. George K. Holmes, of the Bureau of Mortgages, shows that as far back as 1893 the total public, corporate, and private debt of this country had reached the enormous aggregate of \$18,027,170,546. Under Republican domination, under the operation and effect of Republican policies, the public and private debt of the country had reached those figures.

But this most serious situation ought to be stated in connection with those figures. The general prosperity of any people, the perpetuity of free government anywhere, as the history of the world shows, depends upon the number of its people who own the homes in the country, and I desire to recite here in this connection some figures showing how the home owners of the country are divided, according to the statements made in the census of 1900.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to have a minute or two more.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. RUSSELL. I want it understood in connection with the argument made by gentlemen on the other side that the policies of the dominant party are the responsible factors for the conditions now prevailing. According to the census of 1900 there were 7,205,219 families in this country—in other words, only 46 per cent—that owned their homes. And of those families 2,179,769 had their homes mortgaged for debt. In other words, there was only 4,727,542 of the 16,000,000 families, as I believe, in this country who owned their homes free of debt. Now, then, if Republican policies are to be credited by the simple assumption, without argument, with the building up of \$70,000,000,000 of wealth since 1860, then let Republican policies face the charge that to-day only 32 per cent of the families of this country own their homes perfectly free from debt, and that according to census figures of 1900 there are 10,701,445 families in this country who either do not own their homes or whose homes were mortgaged to secure debt against them.

As to congestion of wealth, not only has wealth been increased in this country (and I concede that proposition), but it has been concentrated and congested under the prevalence and operation of Republican policies into a few hands. The most conservative statisticians to-day say that under Republican policies seven-eighths of the people of this country own only one-eighth of its wealth, while one-eighth of the people of this country to-day own seven-eighths of its wealth. To state the proposition in another form, Republican policies have concentrated seven-eighths of the wealth of the people of this country in the hands of about 7,000,000 people, while the balance of the people own only about one-eighth of its wealth.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, those policies are gradually driving the farmer off the farm. In 1860 we had in this country a percentage of urban population of about 16 per cent. Under the operation of Republican policies there has been driven into the cities of this country over 33 per cent of its population. So that, comparing the situation of the country to-day under Republican rule with that formerly under Democratic rule you have a forcible object lesson of the difference between a splendid land and a happy land. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND].

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I had occasion, or at least took occasion, to remark on what I then supposed might be the make-up of the committees. I find I was somewhat mistaken if I thought the question in the mind of the Speaker was whether he should give us 8 or 7 members upon the large committees of 17 members. I am inclined now to think that the question was whether he should give us any membership upon the important committees of the House.

I expect to offer, and I hope that the Committee on Rules will consider favorably, a resolution to add one to each of the sixteen great committees of the House, committees composed of 17 members each, and that this one added member be taken from the minority side.

As it is now, the committees are really sandwich committees, the crackers being the Republicans on each side, and the meat (the Democrats) between—6 out of 17. [Laughter.] That is the way the case stands on sixteen great committees in a House where the Republican majority is 30.

Now, I have no disposition to find fault unduly, and I have no disposition to give utterance too frequently or too forcibly to fault where I do find it, but I regard that as an outrage upon the minority. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I regard it as treating us unjustly and unfairly; I regard it as taking unjust advantage of the control of this House for partisan purposes.

A good many of these committees are committees that have no political matters to deal with. They have the business legislation of the country to deal with. Yet they are made up in the most bitterly partisan way. Take the Committee on Appropriations, a committee that is found upon this floor, when bills come from it, united in support of them. Since I have been a member of the House I never yet have known a minority report from that committee. Yet out of 17 members the minority of the House is represented by 6 only, though in total membership it has within 30 of as many members as the majority.

Now, there is nothing but partisanship in that. There is nothing but injustice and unfairness in it. It deprives us of what we are entitled to. It puts upon members on the other side, if they do their duty, more work than they ought to have. It deprives the membership on this side of proper opportunity to do work upon the committees, and a large portion of the work of the House and the Senate comes from and is done in the committees. Such a course is not conducive to good legislation. It is not designed to bring about good legislation. It will not bring about good

legislation. Whatever others may do, I for one wish it distinctly understood that I am utterly opposed—my opposition, I understand perfectly, may be fruitless—but I am utterly opposed to such action, and while the opportunity yet remains—while that much of the privilege and right of a Representative is preserved to me—I will take occasion, when it seems fitting, to express my opinion about it. Sixteen prominent committee places are given to gentlemen upon that side by taking them away from gentlemen upon this side; sixteen men over there are upon these important committees (to say nothing of the lesser committees) who ought not to be upon them.

It carries favor over there; it tends to weld together compactly and closely the mass over there. It tends to make the power of the Speaker greater, by enabling him to decree what shall be done, and taking away the independence upon that side which might interfere with the carrying out of his decrees. It ought to have the effect of welding us more closely together. We ask nothing except what we think we are entitled to. I for one ask absolutely no favors for myself or for any man upon this side, but we have a right to ask what is just and what is fair. We have a right to ask what our membership entitles us to. We have a right to ask what the interests of the country in good legislation entitle us to. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman on that side consume some of his time or shall I go on?

Mr. PAYNE. Just as you say.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I wish the gentleman would consume some of his time.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, it is evident, I think, that our Democratic brethren are using the early days of the Fifty-eighth Congress in their biennial occupation of manufacturing campaign issues. It is a harmless and interesting pastime, and probably ought to be encouraged among the members of a political organization that thus far has not established a great reputation for manufacturing anything else. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Long fastings away from the political pie counter have made the Democratic heart somewhat cynical and misanthropic. Long wanderings in the humiliating valley of popular disfavor have so wrought upon the Democratic nerves that perhaps we ought not to be surprised that they reach eagerly after the most elusive beckonings of hope until the election recently of a Democratic governor in the State of Rhode Island, by a largely reduced Democratic majority it is true, is heralded as a sure omen of approaching great Democratic victories.

And yet, making all allowance for this and for the fact that in such discussions perhaps we should hardly expect that gentlemen so engaged will draw in all respects fair inferences from the facts of history, I was not altogether prepared for a statement made the other day by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], in effect if not in language, that the notorious financial embarrassments of the Government during the last Cleveland Administration were properly to be charged against the McKinley tariff and were not the result, as we have always supposed, of general Democratic incompetency. Now, since that statement has been made I have taken the trouble to examine some of the official figures, and I am able to assure the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] that his recent statement is palpably an error; but that he was scientifically and historically accurate in another statement which he made upon the floor of this House in the month of February, 1902, when he said in our hearing that the second election of Grover Cleveland was the greatest calamity that has happened to the human race since the fall of Adam.

The last two and a half years of the Administration of Benjamin Harrison were under the operation of the McKinley tariff. During that entire Administration of Benjamin Harrison the receipts exceeded the disbursements of a Republican House and Senate by \$205,000,000, and during the Harrison Administration the Republicans were able to reduce the national debt in the sum of \$259,000,000. The first eighteen months of the Cleveland Administration only were under the McKinley tariff law. During those months it is true that the Democratic expenditures exceeded their receipts by several million dollars, but the discrepancy in the Treasury during that period was due less to the McKinley tariff than to the great and yawning disparity between the receipts and the budget of Democratic expenditures.

If the expenditures of the first year and a half of the Cleveland Administration had been no greater than for the like period of the Harrison Administration, there would have been a surplus of something like \$30,000,000 during Cleveland's Administration under the McKinley tariff. The fact stands out in history that upon the adoption of the Wilson-Gorman tariff, in August, 1894, the receipts began systematically to be reduced. There was no reduction, but an increase, in expenditures. There was not a

year during the Cleveland Administration that the expenditures were not vastly in excess of the receipts; and taking the four years together the expenditures under their Democratic budget were \$187,000,000 in excess of their receipts.

The exact figures are as follows:

March 1, 1893, to March 1, 1894: Receipts, \$323,463,100.76; disbursements, \$371,269,576.28; deficiency, \$47,806,475.52.

March 1, 1894, to March 1, 1895: Receipts, \$308,725,956.58; disbursements, \$366,650,441.79; deficiency, \$57,924,485.21.

March 1, 1895, to March 1, 1896: Receipts, \$325,254,564.51; disbursements, \$351,094,307.53; deficiency, \$25,839,743.02.

March 1, 1896, to March 1, 1897: Receipts, \$308,481,047.69; disbursements, \$364,559,067.55; deficiency, \$56,078,019.86.

For the four years: Receipts, \$1,265,924,669.54; disbursements, \$1,453,573,393.15; deficiency, \$187,648,723.61.

The McKinley tariff became operative October 6, 1890, and the Wilson-Gorman tariff, August 28, 1894.

During the period of the McKinley tariff, under the Harrison Administration, there was a surplus of receipts over disbursements of \$54,504,288.80. During the period of the Wilson-Gorman tariff of the Cleveland Administration, which was practically the last two and one-half years of that Administration, the expenditures exceeded the revenues by \$110,879,005.48. It is evident, therefore, that the trouble with the Cleveland Administration was not the McKinley tariff. The trouble with that Administration was the inadequate revenues from the Wilson-Gorman tariff and extravagant expenditures in a period of profound peace.

There is another side to this. Benjamin Harrison turned over to the Cleveland Administration gold in the Treasury to the amount of \$217,672,948. The gold began systematically to decline, and continued to do so until March, 1895, when there were only \$138,593,280 of gold in the Treasury, only \$38,593,280 in excess of the compulsory reserve. One after another, loans were issued, until \$262,000,000 in gold were borrowed at rates of 4 and 5 per cent interest. A large portion of this gold was of course used to meet this deficit of \$187,000,000 in current expenses.

At the coming in of the Republican Administration an entire change took place. The receipts under the new Dingley tariff were immediately restored to a normal basis; the expenditures harmonized with the receipts. The Spanish war loan of \$198,000,000 was effected at 3 per cent, and from that time forward, notwithstanding the Spanish war and the immense expenditures incident to it, and the wider responsibilities our Government has assumed, we have systematically reduced the national debt until the annual interest charge of \$53,000,000 bequeathed to us by the Cleveland Administration has been reduced to an annual interest charge of twenty-four millions. We have during this period issued something like \$445,000,000 of 2 per cent bonds, with which we have redeemed a large proportion of the 4 and 5 per cent bonds of Cleveland's Administration and other outstanding 3 per cent bonds. Our 2 per cent bonds are at a premium, so that the highest rate of interest you can realize on a Government bond purchased in the market to-day is 1.7 per cent.

The day before yesterday, when I sought the figures, and I presume the same is true to-day, gold in the United States Treasury had reached the high-water mark. The amount of gold in the Treasury upon that day was \$672,264,623. This is more gold than was ever in the Treasury of the United States at any period from the days of George Washington until now. There is more money in the aggregate in the Treasury than at any period from Washington until now, the statement showing \$1,399,067,014.05. During the month of October last the surplus, or available cash balance then in the Treasury, was larger than ever reached in our history, and the balance is but a little less at the present time.

Now, whatever our Democratic friends may urge upon the attention of the public, it seems to me that their strong hold can not be in an appeal to history along the lines of the industrial and financial progress of the country. The tariff policy, the protective principle, I regard as firmly established as any other principle in American politics. This has become an American policy. In my judgment, at no time, at least not in this generation, will any great political party be enabled to direct the financial and industrial affairs of the country that does not recognize in some form the protective as against the free-trade system.

I do not believe in the suggestion that there is no proper function for the Democratic party to perform in American progress, but their strong hold is not to revise Republican tariffs or to prepare the fiscal policies of this Government. [Applause on the Republican side.] The mission, Mr. Speaker, of the Democracy is evidently to apply the brakes, but not the motive power. If we could induce our Democratic friends to be content with the useful occupation of applying the brake lever instead of periodically aspiring to climb into the driver's seat and assume the reins of government, the chariot of American progress would continue to move majestically forward. But whenever they usurp the driver's

place American capital will flee to a place of safety, American labor will take another enforced vacation, and the great American industries will make another temporary assignment for the benefit of creditors. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I think while we are debating the question as to what principles have really led to the prosperity that we are enjoying as a people, which has never been excelled in the history of the world, the greatest era of prosperity any nation has ever experienced, we ought not to forget the conditions confronting us in 1896. One half of the railroads of the country were in the hands of receivers in 1896, and the other half were scarcely making running expenses. A wave of financial disaster swept over the country, carrying down before it thousands of our most reputable business concerns. In the Chicago convention of that year, the convention of statesmen and patriots who met there to give us the solution, the way out of four years of Democratic rule and its results, made some very plain statements, and one of these plain statements was in the speech of Governor Altgeld, of Illinois, in which he gave us the industrial conditions at that time. Here is Governor Altgeld's characterization. It is a Democratic diagnosis of a Democratic case. It ought to be read occasionally in these prosperous times "lest we forget:"

Rarely in the history of the Government has an assembly of free men been confronted with such far-reaching questions—with questions that are fraught with so much weal or woe to human kind—as those with which this convention must deal. For a number of years there has existed in Europe and this country stagnation in trade, paralysis in industry, and a suspension of enterprise. We have seen the streets of our city filled with idle men, with hungry women, and with ragged children. Why, to-day it takes all that the farmer, all that the producer can scrape together to pay interest, taxes, and other fixed charges. The farmer is prostrated, the merchant does less business, the manufacturer can not sell his produce, and the laborer finds that there is nobody to buy the things that he makes; therefore he is out of employment.

Compare these conditions as described by Governor Altgeld with the conditions of to-day, with which we are all familiar. "The farmer is prostrated," says Governor Altgeld. The farmer was never so prosperous as now. The census of 1900 shows that the value of American farms and farm property increased more rapidly for the previous decade than the capital invested in railroads and manufactures, phenomenal as was the growth in those directions. And the value of farms and farm properties is greater than the aggregate value of railroads and manufacturing establishments. The American farmer is still the chief American capitalist. Governor Altgeld continues: "The manufacturer can not sell his produce, and the laborer finds that there is nobody to buy the things that he makes; therefore he is out of employment." There is now a ready market for the products of our factories, and any man who wants work can have it at a good compensation.

The Republican tariff protects the American market for the American producer; free trade opens the American market for the foreign producer.

If America were entirely a nation of consumers, our interest would be with free trade, which would reduce prices on all commodities to the lowest possible notch. But we are a producing nation, and the prosperity of the farmer, the laborer, and the manufacturer depends upon a profitable home market. Open our American market to the cheap labor and lower citizenship of foreign countries and you destroy the prosperity and degrade the citizenship of our people.

You say the American citizen is a consumer as well as a producer. That is true. But if he is paid well for his product, whether it be from the farm, the factory, or the labor of brain or hand, he is able to pay a good price for what he consumes and has something left over for a rainy day. Eras of high prices are eras of general prosperity; eras of low prices, of calamity. This is why the Democratic party with its free-trade ideas can never safely guide American industries. Free-trade heresies are not adapted to the necessary conditions of a developing and advancing republic. They belong to monarchy, with its simple and contented peasantry and an unambitious laboring class, who have not experienced the broader liberty and greater responsibilities of American citizenship.

The best test of a political principle, as well as a principle in ethics, is the question, Does it work well? Theoretically free trade has been a favorite among the scholars and in the textbooks, but practically a protective tariff has always worked well in this country. From a consuming people, dependent in large measure upon the products of other countries, we have become a producing people, competing for the commerce of the world. Yankee ingenuity, encouraged by protective tariff and supplemented by the superior skill and intelligence of the American laborer, has invaded the markets of all countries. About one-third of our agricultural and manufactured products now finds market abroad. We are to-day selling silks to France, furniture to Germany, cutlery to England, and tin plate to Wales. What would have been considered commercial fiction even ten years ago has become commercial fact in 1903.

Thirty years ago Great Britain, Germany, and France were all

larger exporters than the United States. Now we exceed them all. The United States is now the world's greatest exporter.

The United States produces more wheat than any other country. She produces more corn than all other countries combined. She produces more beef and pork and more of the money metals than any other country. She produces more cotton than all other countries—three-fourths of the cotton of the world. She produces more coal, and cheaper coal, than any other country, and more petroleum. In extent of manufactured articles and raw materials we are now first. Our manufactures are now nearly double those of Great Britain, and about equal to those of Germany, France, and Russia combined. It will be seen, therefore, that in breadstuffs, meat, fuel, and clothing, that which feeds, warms, and clothes the human family, the United States now leads the world. What is more important, of these three essentials of human life and comfort the United States has a very large surplus annually over what is required for her own people. No other great nation, unless it be Russia, can feed, warm, and clothe its own people. England and Germany are largely dependent upon American breadstuffs. Germany must buy annually \$100,000,000 worth of food products, or many of her people must go hungry.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] a few days ago expressed great fear lest we be made the object of retaliatory legislation on the part of European countries. There is no danger of our being excluded from European markets for food products by unfriendly legislation or otherwise. Our products form a very large proportion of what they are buying constantly. To exclude them from their markets would so advance the price of their remaining inadequate supply that food would be beyond the reach of the common people. A future open market for our breadstuffs in Europe is therefore assured by European necessities.

The Dingley tariff is doubtless imperfect in many of its schedules. It is, however, I believe, the best tariff act that has yet been devised from an American standpoint. Particular schedules should be modified from time to time to meet changed conditions. Gradual modification of particular items would be infinitely better than a general overturning of our present system. It is probable that a liberal use of the reciprocity principle might furnish sufficient modification of the tariff for several years to come. I believe thoroughly in the reciprocity policies advocated by James G. Blaine and William McKinley. And I believe also that one of the best expositions of the reciprocity doctrine is to be found in McKinley's last speech at Buffalo.

The reciprocity treaty with Cuba, approved by the House at this session and soon to be approved by the Senate, is a beginning in the right direction. Republicans can well afford to expand our commerce with other countries by similar treaties, where this can be done without seriously injuring our own industries.

The protective tariff must be modified by its friends and not destroyed by its enemies. The hard-headed, successful American farmer, and the intelligent, progressive American laborer, both of whom know a good thing when they see it, are not ready, and, in my judgment, will not be ready in this generation to invite another carnival of calamity by committing our political and industrial future to the aggregation of free-trade, free-silver, and free-law devotees masquerading in these latter days in the guise and habiliments of Democracy. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED].

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this Congress the Democratic minority in this body selected as its official mouthpiece and floor leader the exceedingly able and amiable gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who has as his assistant the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND]. Next in leadership comes the other gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Democratic statistician, wit, and prophet. These leaders have announced as the platform on which they intend to fight the "revision of the tariff," and the statistician, wit, and prophet from Missouri has already prophesied that upon that platform they will elect a President and a House of Representatives in 1904. Now, I want to call the attention of this House and of the country to the character of tariff revision we are likely to get when those gentlemen get control of this House, if they ever do. In 1897, in the extra session, upon the 24th of March, during the pendency of the Dingley tariff bill, the gentleman from Mississippi said:

As a Democrat who believes in free trade, or the nearest approach to it, I rejoiced in the passage of the Wilson-Gorman bill.

He claimed that there were too many protective features even in that bill, but added that "there was within it a germ from which something approaching free trade might have come by evolution."

He further said in the same speech: "I am not a protectionist, and I do not believe in protectionism."

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] said:

Where do we stand? Opposed to any tariff duties except such as are necessary to raise needed revenue.

But the other gentleman from Missouri said, speaking of the Dingley bill, the present tariff law, under which the country has enjoyed so much prosperity:

I am dead against this bill. It is a vicious, a monstrous, and unnecessary measure.

In the same speech he said:

I am a free trader, and I glory in the fact. I rejoice in the record that we free traders made in the House in 1894, in the Fifty-third Congress. Nearly all that was good in the Wilson bill was put there by the free traders.

Still further he said:

The trouble with the Wilson-Gorman bill was not that it contained too much free trade, but that it did not contain free trade enough.

Our friends upon the other side are not vicious at heart. I do not suppose they really mean to bring harm to the country. The trouble is that they are possessed of a sort of "Happy Hooligan" brand of statesmanship which, when put in operation, brings destruction to themselves and everybody else. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The gentlemen ought to know that the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill which they thus commend closed more mines and factories and mills and banks, and drove into bankruptcy more railroads and corporations and firms and individuals, and threw more men out of employment than any other piece of legislation ever enacted in the history of the world.

In many of the mining and manufacturing districts it actually dispensed with the use of toothpicks, because they are not considered a prime article of necessity where soup is the only diet. [Laughter.] And yet these leaders think it ought to have gone further. Their words I have quoted from the RECORD show that if they had their own way absolutely they would "revise" the tariff out of existence. The people are not likely to give them that opportunity.

Great lamentation has been heard from that side of the Chamber because of the fact that the Pennsylvania Steel Company has recently, in competition with German and other manufacturers, secured a contract for the future delivery of 20,000 tons of rails for the Mecca Railway at prices alleged to be somewhat lower than the present prevailing price in this country.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BENNY] declared that this country had been injured to the extent of the difference between the price to be received abroad and the ruling price of rails here, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] seemed to consider it a crowning outrage that four great railroads have, as he alleges, agreed to make a reduction of 33½ per cent in the rates of transportation upon all steel products intended for export.

Well, now, the farmer, in whom our friends on the other side just about election time always evince so much interest, did have to "gnaw a flea" during the last Democratic Administration, but he never has been, to any considerable extent, a consumer of rails. The only customers for rails are railroads, and if, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] alleges, the railroads themselves are encouraging this outrage, I do not believe that either they or the farmer are, after all, so much outraged as the gentleman from New Jersey seems to think.

Now, I am one of those who believe that the American farmer and the American laborer and even the American railroads themselves are benefited by the sale of American rails in foreign countries. The plant of the Pennsylvania Steel Company is at Steelton, in my district, three miles from the city of Harrisburg, in which I live. It is not a trust nor controlled by a trust; it is not a combination of any kind; it is not the result of the merger or consolidation of two or more corporations. It is just a single corporation, operating its own plant in competition with the United States Steel Corporation and other great rivals. It is operated upon very intelligent business principles by very competent and intelligent business men.

I have no personal investment in it in any way whatever, but I do take a great interest in its welfare because of my friendship and respect for its officers and because the interests of so many of my constituents—farmers, coal miners, and merchants, as well as steel operatives—are dependent upon its success. Within one year after the last election of Grover Cleveland it, along with other manufacturing establishments in my district, went into the hands of receivers.

In October, 1896, it employed 3,602 men. Since the election of President McKinley and the passage of the Dingley tariff bill it has had more than 8,000 men upon its pay roll at one time. It now yields a fair though not excessive return upon the capital invested. The sale of 20,000 tons of rails abroad (and that is only one item out of a number; it has within the past few days contracted to deliver 8,000 tons in the City of Mexico) will, of itself, bring over \$450,000 of foreign money into this country, and at

least 90 per cent of it will reach the pockets of the laborers who made the steel or mined the coal and iron ore which entered into its production.

I hold in my hand a copy of a book entitled "The Iron Industry," published by a firm in New York. It is edited by Mr. H. H. Campbell, of Steelton, Pa., who by education, wide personal experience, and extended travel and observation in foreign lands is well qualified for such a task. He is not an extremist upon the tariff question. He discusses this very question. He contends that in determining the cost of such manufactures there should be allowed interest at 6 per cent on all money actually invested in the plant and an allowance of at least 10 per cent for depreciation of plant, which goes on whether or not it is operated to its full capacity. He thinks it only fair that the home trade should pay a price fairly covering both these items, but adds that—

It becomes good policy to ignore these items (interest on capital and depreciation of plant) on competitive business for foreign deliveries, since they are both fixed quantities, not depending on the amount of steel produced, and the extra output caused by such foreign deliveries cheapens the cost to the manufacturer. Moreover, certain lines of foreign trade can not be held if prices are varied with every local advance.

Having secured, for instance, the business of a certain railway in Australia, it is evidently quite impossible to retain it if the price quoted follows every boom in the home market, and it is certainly good policy to keep the trade of this railway for future business in spite of the hue and cry about lower prices to foreign buyers.

This argument is not new, but has been an accepted commercial and industrial maxim in every country under both protection and free trade, and all the "prices abroad" so freely quoted are based on this rule as existing in foreign lands. It is even true that bounties are actually paid in some instances to encourage export trade. * * *

A steel works, in common with every manufacturing plant, is a benefit to the general public in many ways. It contributes to the payment of taxes and thus saves an equivalent amount of individual expenditure. It is the foundation of large communities, which influence and increase the general prosperity of the country by giving a market for all kinds of commodities. It supplies freight to the railroads in enormous quantities. In the twelve months immediately preceding the time of writing the works with which I am connected received 54,903 cars and sent out 17,471 cars loaded with finished material.

Allowing for some empty cars received and estimating the average of the whole to be 30 tons per car, we have a total of 2,170,000 tons of traffic and a total train length of 500 miles. The average length of haul is unknown, but was over 200 miles. This business brings in an enormous income to the railroads, the gross receipts from a steel works being four or possibly six times as much as though a similar amount of material were imported from abroad and there were no raw materials or incidental supplies to assemble.

It will be evident on the slightest consideration that the cost of moving other freight is reduced by this increased business and the establishment of other industries thereby made possible, which in turn react by further lowering the cost of transportation by their contribution to tonnage moved.

His argument is well sustained by the official figures, for while labor and nearly everything else in this country is higher now than it was in 1896 the average rate charged by railroads per ton of freight per mile is lower, made possible by the increase of traffic resulting from the increased products of mines and factories. The reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission show that the average rate per ton per mile, which was eight hundred and seventy-eight one-thousandths part of a cent in 1893, had been reduced to seven hundred and fifty-seven one-thousandths part of a cent in 1902.

That was the average of all the railroads in the United States. Upon the great trunk lines the freight charges were less. I happen to have at hand a statement of the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company showing that its average charge per ton per mile in 1903 was six and four-tenths mills, and I have no doubt that the average rate per ton per mile charged by the Pennsylvania Railroad Company was fully as low, and perhaps lower, so that the public which has prospered in so many other directions has certainly not suffered in the matter of railroad rates, either as the result of increased tariffs under the Dingley law or of the sales of rails or other American products in foreign markets.

Another interesting fact in connection with railroads is that during Cleveland's Administration the number of railway employees fell off from 873,602 in 1893 to 823,476 in 1897, a decrease of 50,126 in four years. In the succeeding five years, under McKinley and Roosevelt, the number increased to 1,189,315, an increase of 365,839 in five years. The wages paid railway employees in 1897, the year Cleveland went out, were \$465,601,581. The wages paid them in 1902 amounted to the vast sum of \$576,028,592, an increase of \$210,427,011 per annum.

Railroads are a good index to all other kinds of business. The number of additional men employed and increased amount paid them in wages in mines and factories since the Gorman-Wilson bill was repealed can not be estimated. The people of this country will be slow to put in power again the men who helped to enact it, and still less likely to turn the Government over to the present leaders of Democracy, who would prefer absolute free trade.

There are doubtless some articles upon which the tariff could safely be reduced, but stability of rates is very important. Much tariff tinkering is destructive of business. When revision is necessary it will be accomplished by the party which favors American

labor and prefers that American products shall be sold in foreign markets rather than that foreign manufactures shall crowd out our own people in our own markets.

Foreign-made rails have been imported into this country and sold here for \$145 per ton. Now they are made and sold here at \$28. Our railroads thus get cheaper rails, while our miners and iron and steel workers do the work and from their wages are enabled to and do become the best customers for the products of our farms. If selling our steel products in foreign markets helps to bring about, or continue, or improve these conditions, why do our friends object?

The gentleman from Missouri predicted in 1897 that if the Dingley bill were passed they would in the next Congress have 100 majority and elect a Democratic President in 1900. That prophecy failed, and the one he has just made, which, if the people believed it, would send \$100,000,000 capital into hiding within thirty days, is equally absurd and equally unlikely of fulfillment. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. I ask the gentleman from Mississippi to occupy his time now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am of an optimistic temperament, but I have grown to despair of the abilities of figures and facts and history to make the Republicans—upon this floor, at any rate—remember that in 1892 and 1893 and part of 1894 there was a world-wide panic; that it did not exist in the United States alone, but existed everywhere; that it had begun before Mr. Cleveland was elected, and continued after he was elected. If any one of these gentlemen were writing a history outside of politics he would note that, and he would dwell, as an interesting event in that history, upon the depression in the West and South, when a desperate and suffering people were clutching at straws and seeking desperate remedies under Harrison's Administration, before Cleveland was even nominated. But it is hopeless to expect from the average Republican intellect anything on that subject "upon the eve of an election." They will neither revise the tariff nor revise their utterances in accordance with the facts of history upon the eve of an election. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] has this morning rejoiced my heart. He is the first Republican who has taken the advanced step of defending the system of charging the foreigner a lower price for the products of American manufacturing establishments than is charged to the American for exactly the same goods.

He has defended it, attempted to explain it, and attempted to justify it. He has said there is nothing in an extortionate home price for steel rails that hurts the farmer of America. He has said that "farmers never eat steel rails." No, Mr. Speaker, but rails sometimes eat farmers. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If the gentleman does not know that the shippers of this country pay for the rails, and that all in the world that the railroads do is to use the money in the first instance and collect it later on, he ought not to be upon the floor of the American House of Representatives. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I know him so well, I know his intelligence so thoroughly, that I know he knows those things better even than I possibly could, because of his superior ability to learn.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other day the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] said, "Can you point to a day in the history of the American people when Americans were receiving higher wages?" I answered, upon the spur of the moment, "Yes, this day one year ago." I might have answered with equal truth "This day two years ago." I might have taken several other dates, but I happened to take that.

Mr. Speaker, a wage consists in the net return which the laborer receives. The cost of living has advanced within the last seven years very much indeed. But I shall not go into that; I shall not for the purposes of this reply take that into consideration. The absolute wage rate, the gross amount paid independently of the question of the net receipts—the gross wage—has decreased since this day one year ago. Why, I just happened to pick up the Washington Post of this morning's date, and I saw that the New England cotton manufacturers are getting together still further to reduce the wages paid to operatives in the cotton mills. I see that in the cotton mills of New England there are employed 175,000 hands. Sixty-five thousand of them have already had their wages reduced 10 per cent in the last year. They are threatened by a combination of mills with a yet further decrease.

I saw some days since that the tin manufacturers have reduced wages. I find they met and then adopted, in accordance with this new Republican "recoupment" plan defended by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a scale of wages whereby the laborers were to receive 25 per cent less for work on products for export, and that has resulted in an agreement to pay and receive about 2 per cent general reduction. That is another idea that I have not time to follow up in the seven minutes, nor have I time to go into other cognate matters, but in later remarks some time I shall.

Why, you gentlemen have run protectionism mad. You not only want "to give everybody everything" that they want, like Tit-tlebat Titmouse, in Ten Thousand a Year, but you want to give people things they do not want. Here we find the National Association of Agricultural Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers met the other day in the city of Chicago and passed certain resolutions with certain preambles. The first preamble is this:

Whereas the members of this association and we believe a large majority of the people of the United States believe that our tariff duties in many instances are too high and a gradual reduction should be made; and

Whereas that dominant party of the nation has on more than one occasion committed itself in convention platforms and by legislative action to the policy of reciprocity and to the promotion of the commercial treaties, and many of its most brilliant and able statesmen have strenuously urged the faithful performance of this party engagement; and

Whereas in the early period of this country's existence protection to manufacturers was established in order to enlarge our domestic market, encourage immigration, diversify industries, furnish a greater opportunity for a diversified talent, and afford a larger field for enterprise, and establish an independence of foreign nations in supplying ourselves with the necessary military supplies during the exigencies of war, in all of which we have succeeded to a marvelous extent.

Then this resolution:

Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge upon Congress the faithful performance not only of the repeatedly expressed but the implied promises contained in the Republican platform, and the utterances of the Republican leaders who have favored reciprocity, by ratifying treaties already before them and thus encouraging the negotiation of other treaties equally desirable, and carry out the policy of our late lamented President, the Hon. William McKinley, who so ably advocated the principles of reciprocity in his last public address.

Respectfully submitted.

F. E. MYERS, President.

W. W. COLLIER, Chairman Ex. Com.

F. E. LUKENS, Secretary.

We have been asking you—I do not know how long—to reduce the duties upon agricultural implements, so that the farmers of this country can get the implements behind which they walk in the sweat of their brows as they earn a hard living at a less price, and you have responded that it would "destroy the agricultural implement industry" of the country. And here these very agricultural implement men meet in association and tell you that it will not destroy them, that the reduction ought to take place; but you are going to "recommend the poisoned chalice to their lips," whether they want it or not. You are going to extend protectionism to men who tell you that they do not need it and that it is wrong for them to have it.

Here are also the New England shoe men, who tell you they do not need as much so-called protection as they get, and would be glad to get less if you will reduce the duty on hides; but you will not give it. It is just like the story John Allen used to tell of the fellow who got drunk, who told his wife that neither she nor her physician could get him to accept a drink of whiskey. Said he, "I promised not to take it and I won't take it; I declare I won't take it. I won't take it; no, sir; but you, Jane, might get somebody just as strong as you are, and if I won't take it you two could make me take it." So you are making people take things that they do not need.

I want to insert this article to which I have referred, and I also ask permission to insert something from the "Citizens' Industrial Association," an association of employers, declaring in favor of free trade and free competition, not in products, but in labor, gentlemen, "don't you know." That is the sort of free trade and "free competition" Republicans want. Free ingress of pauper labor. [Laughter and loud applause on the Democratic side.]

On second thought I will keep back the proceedings of the "Citizens' Industrial Association," as the text for fuller remarks later—

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. PAYNE. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker? The SPEAKER. The gentleman has eight minutes remaining.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I made some observations a few days ago and spoke of a period of seventy-two years of Democratic policy, a period that terminated on the 4th day of March, 1861. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL], who perhaps was not born at that time, insists that on that day the American people, the people of the United States, were in a more prosperous and happy and hopeful condition than they were on the 4th day of March this present year.

Now, that may be the opinion of the gentleman from Texas. He could not have known anything about the earlier period, because he was not born, and I take it that he knows but very little about the other period, as he has very recently escaped from the State of Texas [laughter and applause on the Republican side], and that is not a State to which anybody goes to gain accurate information as to the economic conditions of the people of the United States. [Laughter.] But if it gives him any satisfaction to think that at the end of this first period this country of ours was more wealthy, its finances in better condition, its labor better

employed, wages upon a grander scale, money more abundant, and great enterprises more frequently undertaken and carried out by American capital—if it pleases him to think that we were in that happier situation in 1831 than now, I am perfectly content that he should be as felicitous as he chooses over that delusion. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL] indulged in some statistics as old as the story he told. [Laughter.] The story was so ancient that it was told by the animals when they were going into Noah's ark. [Laughter.] The gentleman seems to have lived in oblivion, as my friend from Iowa just remarked, because he is comparing the debt of 1860 of the United States with the debt of the United States in 1903. He does not seem to realize that Texas and a few of the surrounding States entered into a great rebellion for five years in the sixties that is the cause of the increase of the debt, but he seems to be inclined to blame the whole thing onto the Republican party.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] sometimes tries to be funny and sometimes he tries to scold. This morning seems to be his scolding day. He has discovered another tremendous outrage on the minority because, as he says, they are not represented as they ought to be on the committees. It can not be a personal grievance to the gentleman from Missouri, because I see that he is designated on the Committee on Rules and the Committee on the Judiciary. My genial friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the leader of the minority, has been kinder to the gentleman from Missouri than he has to some other gentlemen on that side; for instance, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], who remains on the Committee on Ways and Means, but has been taken off the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads. The gentleman from Missouri says that the minority does not have a proper representation on the committees, and he calls it an outrage.

Well, Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the Fifty-first Congress the Republicans had 6 majority. The Committee on Ways and Means then consisted of 13 members, of which the majority had 8 and the minority 5. In the Fifty-second Congress, which was Democratic by 129 majority, the Democrats took 10 places and the Republicans 5, increasing the committee by 2 and making it 15. In the Fifty-third Congress the committee was increased to 17, and the Democrats had 84 majority, and they took 11 places and left the minority 6. The Fifty-fourth Congress was Republican by 135 majority, and we took 11 members and left the minority still with 6. In the Fifty-fifth Congress there were 50 Republican majority and 11 Republicans and 6 Democrats on the committee. In the Fifty-sixth Congress our majority was 13, and we conceded the Democrats 7 and had 10 Republican members upon the committee. The Fifty-seventh Congress had 34 Republican majority, and we took 11 places for the Republicans and left 6 for the Democrats. In this Congress we have 30 majority, with 11 Republicans on the committee and 6 Democrats. The same is true of the Committee on Appropriations. The same is true in equal proportion of all the great committees of the House. The Speaker has in the appointment of some of the committees conceded the Democrats additional members in this Congress, but generally he has observed the rule that has been the rule, or the rule in substance, since the Fifty-first Congress. The Fifty-first Congress did not differ in that respect from the preceding Congresses of which Mr. Carlisle was the Speaker—the Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth Congresses.

The proportion has generally been about the same. Why should not the majority have the majority of the members? Why should not we have a good working majority of members? We have the work to do and we are responsible for the legislation; we are responsible to the country for what is done here, and in these committees the majority should have a strong preponderance of the members. It was right when the Democrats had the Congress and had the majority, and it is right now when we have the majority, and all the scolding and fretting on that side of the House will not make it appear to the people that the Speaker of this House has not done the fair thing in appointing the committees. He has gone further than any other Speaker has ever gone and conceded to the leader of the minority the opportunity to name members of the minority on the committees in cases where it did not conflict with the geographical position of the other members of the committees.

So I think that the gentleman when he scolds does not appear to as good advantage as even when he appears with some tame jokes, as he did the other day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will not go further in the discussion of the tariff, because I have not the time. I almost regret that these little discussions that have been indulged in during the last few weeks are not to go on; but by and by we shall have the appropriation bills and gentlemen will have ample opportunity for discussion, and for discussion possibly at times on some subject before the House.

The SPEAKER. The time allowed for this debate has expired. Mr. PAYNE (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.). I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question having been taken,

The SPEAKER. The motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is agreed to, and the House stands adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of the expenditures of his Department for contingent expenses during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1903—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Sarah H. Munnally, administratrix of estate of Eldred Munnally, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of S. A. Rawlins and B. H. Jackson, administrators of estate of James Jackson, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Colly B. Holland against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, a recommendation in reference to a claim for supplies furnished the Indian school at Rapid City, S. Dak.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the president of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, transmitting report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1903—to the Committee on Appropriations, so much as refers to appropriations; remainder to Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RODEY: A bill (H. R. 5664) permitting the county of Taos, in the Territory of New Mexico, to refund its indebtedness at a lower rate of interest—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5665) to establish a fish-culture station at Trout Springs, Gallinas Canyon, San Miguel County, N. Mex.—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5666) to pay clerks in the Indian Territory their salaries as deputy clerks—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BADGER: A bill (H. R. 5667) placing cattle hides on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOWIE: A bill (H. R. 5668) to increase pay of mail carriers on rural free-delivery routes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5669) to repeal an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 5670) to provide for the reestablishment of the west boundary of the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 5671) making an appropriation for the purchase from Forsyth County of a site and building for a post-office and other Government offices in Winston-Salem, N. C., and to authorize the sale of the present post-office site in Winston-Salem to Forsyth County—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5672) authorizing a public building at Highpoint, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUFF: A bill (H. R. 5673) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Greensburg, in the county of Westmoreland and State of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 13) relating to the invitation extended to the Congress by the Louisiana Historical Society—to the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A resolution (H. Res. 36) authorizing the Committee on Insular Affairs to have printing and binding done during the Fifty-eighth Congress—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A resolution (H. Res. 37) authorizing the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions to have printing and binding done during the Fifty-eighth Congress—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 38) authorizing the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions to appoint a clerk to said committee—to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 39) authorizing the chairman of the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions to appoint a janitor to said committee—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. DRAPER: A resolution (H. Res. 40) authorizing the Doorkeeper to appoint Hugh Williams as an additional page in the press gallery—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A resolution (H. Res. 41) requesting the Postmaster-General to send to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads all the papers connected with the recent investigation of his Department—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 5674) to relieve George W. Powers of the charge of dishonorable conduct—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 5675) granting a pension to Norman P. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 5676) granting an increase of pension to John A. Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5677) granting an increase of pension to Bartlett Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5678) granting a pension to Ida J. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5679) for the relief of the heirs of Melvin B. Smith—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 5680) for the relief of Jacob Lyon—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOEBEL: A bill (H. R. 5681) granting an increase of pension to Philip H. Whyrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5682) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Hunt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASKINS: A bill (H. R. 5683) granting an increase of pension to Dudley K. Andross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 5684) granting an increase of pension to William Camblin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 5685) granting a pension to Alonzo Sabin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 5686) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5687) to remove charge of desertion from records of War Department against William B. Meade—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5688) to remove charge of desertion from the records of War Department against James T. Billups—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5689) granting an increase of pension to James Clay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5690) granting an increase of pension to James W. Griffiths—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 5691) granting an increase of pension to Henry Rhinehart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5692) granting an increase of pension to John Shanley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 5693) granting an increase of pension to Joel M. Street—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5694) granting an increase of pension to Logan O'Banion—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5695) granting an increase of pension to Nathan I. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5696) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Wall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5697) granting an increase of pension to William Whiteacre—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5698) granting an increase of pension to John P. Bradfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5699) granting an increase of pension to James P. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5700) granting a pension to Christopher C. Richards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5701) granting a pension to James M. Harper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5702) granting a pension to Allen S. Thatcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5703) granting a pension to Francis Ludlow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5704) granting a pension to Elias Propst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5705) for the relief of Ira C. Hooks—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5706) for the relief of James M. Blankenship—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5707) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David A. Lindsay—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5708) to correct the military record of Micajah Powell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5709) to correct the military record of Ezekiel N. Cohee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUCKING: A bill (H. R. 5710) for the relief of Francis E. Rosier—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 5711) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Chronister—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5712) for the relief of John Wesley Hoyt—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 5713) for the relief of the heirs of Myra Clark Gaines, deceased—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 5714) granting a pension to John D. Deihl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5715) authorizing the President of the United States to nominate Lieut. Samuel Lindsey Graham, now on the retired list, to be a lieutenant-commander on the retired list—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5716) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5717) granting an increase of pension to F. M. Stoke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 5718) granting an increase of pension to Adolph Heiser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5719) granting an increase of pension to Forbes Homiston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 5720) granting an increase of pension to William T. Filler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODEY: A bill (H. R. 5721) for the relief of the inhabitants of Portales, Roosevelt County, N. Mex.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5722) to authorize the payment of \$5,000 to the widow of the late Tranquilino Luna, in full for his contest expenses in the contested-election case of Manzanares against Luna—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5723) giving the Court of Claims jurisdiction to adjudicate two claims for Indian depredations of the estate of Blas Lucero, late of Albuquerque, N. Mex.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5724) for the relief of George Ivers, administrator of William Ivers, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5725) granting a pension to Grace Dressel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 5726) to confer jurisdiction on Court of Claims in case of Elizabeth A. Gill, widow, Albert B. Gill, Emma B. Gill, William F. Gill, and Leonora Gill Thompson, sole legatees and heirs at law of William H. Gill, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5727) granting an increase of pension to James M. Alderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5728) granting an increase of pension to David W. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5729) granting an increase of pension to John Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5730) granting an increase of pension to James McEntire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5731) granting an increase of pension to Charles Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5732) granting an increase of pension to Lewis A. Baird—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5733) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Goodwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5734) granting an increase of pension to John B. Tucker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5735) granting an increase of pension to John Ripperdan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5736) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Woodruff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5737) granting a pension to John Whitehead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5738) granting a pension to W. L. Lawrence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5739) granting a pension to Addison Lusk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5740) granting a pension to Thomas W. Dickey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5741) granting a pension to Cuma Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5742) to remove the charge of desertion from Hugh Ferrell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5743) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Waters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5744) granting an increase of pension to Richard Southard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 5745) for the relief of Richard Crutcher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5746) for the relief of John B. Leavitt's heirs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5747) granting a pension to Hiram Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5748) granting a pension to Granville W. Wyatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5749) granting a pension to James B. Combs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYNN: A bill (H. R. 5750) granting a pension to William Cassidy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BADGER: Memorial of the manufacturers and jobbers in leather goods and the shoe manufacturers of Columbus, Ohio, requesting that hides be placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petition of Sunday School Editors and Publishing Societies, protesting against any increase in postal rates on Sunday-school periodicals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DEEMER: Resolution of General Mansfield Post, No. 48, Grand Army of the Republic, of Mansfield, Department of Pennsylvania, favoring enactment of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Papers to accompany bill to pension Ida J. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: Paper to accompany bill to increase pension of Richard Porterfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to increase pension of Preston D. Roady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAFF: Petition of business men of Wyoming and Buda, Ill., protesting against enactment of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of Arthur Welding and 9 other veterans of the civil war, of Spring Hill, Ill., urging enactment of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: Resolution of the standing committees of the National Business League, favoring enlargement of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of William M. Richardson and 40 others, ex-soldiers, of Warren County, Department of Iowa, favoring enactment of service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: Memorial of American League of Independent Workmen, protesting against the enactment of the proposed eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PAYNE: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 5341, granting a pension to Jenny Petteys—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPALDING: Resolution of Sykeston Prohibition Alliance, No. 18, and Christian Endeavor Society of Southeastern Wells County, N. Dak., favoring the passage of the Hepburn bill relating to the liquor traffic—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of John W. McLane Post, No. 21, of Hunter, Department of North Dakota, favoring the enactment of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: Petition of Sunday School Editors and Publishing Societies, protesting against any increase of postal rates on Sunday-school periodicals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of business men of Castile, Wyoming County, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of the

proposed parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Petition of business men of Enfield, Galatia, and Elizabethtown, Ill., against enactment of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, papers to accompany bill to pension W. L. Lawrence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to pension John B. Tucker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to increase pension of David W. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to increase pension of James M. Alderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to pension John Whitehead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to increase pension of Martin Schubert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill to increase pension of Louis A. Baird—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill to pension Thomas W. Dickey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill to increase pension of John Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill to pension Addison Lusk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill to increase pension of Joseph Goodwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill to increase pension of Charles Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to increase pension of James McEntire—to the committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to pension Cuma Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to pension Richard Southard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYNN: Papers to accompany bill granting increase of pension to William Cassidy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

MONDAY, December 7, 1903.

The Senate met at 11.30 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

REPORT OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, showing the progress made in that work during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1903. This report is ordered to be printed by law, and nothing further need be done in relation to it. It will lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a petition of sundry citizens of Tekoa, Wash., and a petition of the congregation of the Disciples of Christ of Bradford, Troja, and Sullivan counties, Pa., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a memorial of sundry ministers of the Methodist Church of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the repeal of the canteen law; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of the congregation of the Mount Olivet Baptist Church, of Newport, R. I., and a petition of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Newport, R. I., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of the Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church of Parkersburg, W. Va., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BURROWS presented a petition of Andrews Post, No. 294, Department of Michigan, Grand Army of the Republic, of Big Rapids, Mich., praying for the enactment of a service-pension; law which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Leroy, of sundry citizens of West Bay City, of